

Right here I call on brother M. for an explanation. Perhaps I do not understand what he means by synoptist, it is a word that Mr Webster did not seem to know anything of, and I think an explanation is in order. Come Bro, Ed. tell us what you mean, by Synoptist, and why the first three Evangelists are such. But to the question, did Christ and the Apostles eat the Passover on the night of the betrayal? I must emphatically answer yes. And in order to be fully understood, I will take the precaution to state my position all the way through this perplexing question.

1st. Christ and the Apostles ate the last passover, and the first supper, the meal in question partook of the elements of both institutions.

2nd. The Jews were preparing the Passover on the day of crucifixion, and they were right in point of time. It was the day when the true antitype—"Christ our passover was Sacrificed for us."

3rd. That the meal on the night of the betrayal was the dividing line between the Old and New institutions, the last passover and the first supper the one was left, and the other is perpetuated in anticipation of the marriage supper of the Lamb.

1st. There was but one institution called passover and in John 6: 4. We are told that the passover was a "feast of the Jews." It was a feast for the Jews, and none but the Jews had any part or lot in it. The uninvited stranger or Gentile was not allowed according to the law of God to eat of it Ex 12: 43. This then settles the fact that the passover was exclusively for the Jews. I think it will be admitted by all that Christ and the Apostles were Jews. Christ was called a Jew by the women of Samaria. He classed Himself a Jew, John 4: 22, every one of the apostles were Jews, unless the doubtful claim to the exception of Judas Iscariot be correct; but he was an imposter and will not come in contact with our position. We repeat, Christ and the Apostles were Jews. But Christianity took its rise at sometime, and with somebody. When and by whom was it introduced? All will answer, by Christ and the Apostles; correct. But then they were Christians; when, then, did they cease to be Jews? We answer, when they performed the last Jewish act, and that was when they ate the last passover, and instituted the Christian feast of charity or Lord's Supper in its stead, hence we claim that this last meal was both the Jewish passover, and the Lord's supper. The passover was never called supper in all the Bible, and the Apostles and every Christian never called the Lord's supper passover, but here comes the Evangelist Luke and calls the meal in question by both names—singular isn't it? No sir it is plural; it was dual meal to secure a dual purpose, and that was so far as the Feast was concerned to finish one dispensation, and begin another. Well now did Christ really eat the passover? Let us see, "Now the first day of unleavened bread the disciples came to Jesus saying, 'where wilt thou that we prepare for Thee to eat the passover,'" Mat 26: 17. "I will keep the passover at thy house with my disciples," Mat 26: 18, "And they made ready the passover." "Now when the eve was come He sat down with the twelve." Down to what? Why the passover. "And as they did eat," eat what? Why surely that which was prepared, the passover; this is what Matthew says, Mark says substantially the same, and they both establish beyond a possible doubt the fact, that they did eat the passover.

These two Apostles wrote their Gospel at an early date, while the Jewish or passover part of the meal was yet the most prominent in their minds, and hence they make no mention of the supper or Christian part of the meal. Luke wrote his Gospel at a period intermediate—between that of Matthew and Mark, and that of John, and he speaks of both elements of this memorable meal, or if you please, he calls it by both the names Old and New, Jewish and Christian, the one finished, ended, "nailed to the cross," and the other instituted and perpetuated as a Christian ordinance.

It was an event of peculiar interest, and marked an interesting period in the history of God's people; the final ending of one dispensation, and the full and complete establishment of another. Hence Christ said "I have greatly desired to eat

this passover with you before I suffer, for I say unto you I will not anymore eat thereof" (not eat it, but thereof, that is, a part of it, the Christian part, the Feast of charity part, the Lovefeast part) until it is fulfilled in the kingdom of God "Or until the marriage supper of the Lamb has come, when the Bride has made herself ready. Rev 19: 7: 9."

John wrote his Gospel nearly sixty years after the institution of these Christian ordinances, and by this time the Old—dead—Jewish part of the meal had dropped out of notice, and he calls it exclusively by the name of the Christian part of the meal "Supper." And when he speaks of the passover he invariably has reference to the passover that the Jews were preparing on the day of the crucifixion. And as we are now on the second proposition, we remark that the Jews were right in point of time; they intended to kill the passover according to the law. "At the going down of the sun," that is, about 3 o'clock in the afternoon at the very time when Christ the Lamb of God, expired on the cross. This very befitting coincidence is evidence, abundantly sufficient to prove that the Jews were right in the time—the type and the antitype met. A scene that the Sun could not behold without a blush. We deem it not necessary to defend this proposition any farther.

But thirdly, it was the last passover, although twenty hours before the legal time. Christ who was "Lord of the sabbath." We claim was Lord of the passover also, and whether it was the precise time specified in the law or not, he says *My time is at hand*, I will keep the passover at thy house with my Disciples, Math. 26: 18. This settles the whole controversy. He said He would keep the passover, who will say, Lord you will not it is not yet the time, but He says "*My time is at hand*." Need we to go into any farther research? In the name of common sense, how could it have been otherwise? By the time the Jews would have been ready the sun was darkened, the earth trembled, the rocks were rent, the convulsions of nature were such, as to fill the Jews with general consternation, and there was no passover kept by them that year, and never since according to the law. And hence instead of calling this memorable meal the "Last supper," a stupid error into which the old painters of which Bro. Mason speaks as well nearly every body else have fallen call it the *last passover*. And when you speak of the part that remains to this day, and will remain till time shall end, call it the first supper, and not the last. The last supper has not yet come. While the ministry of John the Baptist forms the connecting link between the two dispensations, this ever memorable event of that doleful night forms the period of separation between the two dispensations. This we now feel, is the true position. I feel able to stand on it. I wriggled in the fog long enough, and I invite Bro, Mason and all others, to come out into the clear light of Gospel truth, remember that "Wise men sometimes change but fools never."

P. J. BROWN.

Congress, O, Sep. 28th, 1888.

Nosam's Scraps.

In a railway excavation at Greenock, England a live toad was found embeded in the Stratum—clay Geologists, and other Scientists claim that this toad is certainly from 20,000 to 30,000 years old. As the Stratum-clay dates from the glacial period, the toad's mouth was sealed up, and it breathed slightly through the nostrils, and though the eyes are quite expressive, it does not seem to see. Here is a true wonder, if the whole thing is not a falsehood. We will not attempt to prove or disprove its possibility. But unfortunately we find ignorant and unthinking people referring to this and other statements of science concerning the age of the world, as being direct contradictions to the Scriptures. Many people believe with all their soul that the world is but 6000 years old, and they point the chronological dates given at the heading of every column in the Bible as their proof. That on the basis that the world was created A. M. 1, and that it was only 4000 years old at the birth of Jesus. They believe that each creative day mentioned in our Bibles was of 24 hours. However many of the best Hebrew

scholars translate or define the word "Day," as era or period, so that it would read the "first era" or "Era one." But be this as it may, even if we suppose the creative day to actually consist only of 24 hours, we cannot tell the days, years or centuries that elapsed between the first creative day to the second. Then again, who of us can tell the vast amount of time that the first verse of the Bible embraces. The dates adopted by the Translators of the Authorized Version are those of bishop Usher, who endeavored to base his chronology on the successive terms of years mentioned in the Hebrew text. Whether this toad is 20,000 years old or not, is a matter of small importance, but it is important that we know that the age of the world is more than 6000 years. Science in a thousand places teach us this, and the Bible does not contradict. In this Book of Revelation, God does not satisfy a morbid curiosity by giving dates of all His transactions during the creation. But there is another book—the book of nature; and our intelligence is the key that opens to us the knowledge of the world's great antiquity.

A practical watch-maker tells us that the average watch is composed of 175 different pieces. The balance has 18,000 vibrations per hour, 12, 960,080 in thirty days, which is equal to 9½ miles in twenty four hours, 292 in thirty days, or 3,558 miles in one year, and this is but a watch. We accept it as a masterpiece of science, and give the workman credit. But here is a man, what a superlative piece of mechanism, he is compared to a watch. Yet we do not even respect the great Workman, and are not even thankful to Him. If a man found a watch in the deserts of Arabia, we would never believe it grew there, we would reasonably conclude it was the result of some master mind. Here is man, we admire the delicate organism, but there is a tendency to say man just grew here. Although the evidence of great mechanic-creator is so plain. If we would use the same reason in arriving at spiritual conclusions as we do in physical and temporal affairs, agnosticism and infidelity would vanish.

John L. Porter, who designed and constructed the Merrimac, the first ironclad ever built, and who thus changed completely the system of naval warfare, is now wielding a broadax in the Navy yard at Norfolk. He is an old man almost eighty, but is compelled to toil from early until late. This condition of the great inventor in his old age, we are not told whether it is the result of his own prodigality or the fault of an ungrateful public. Wherever the fault is, the result is the same. We can learn a lesson therefrom. Mr Porter is not the first to realize that there is no dependence to be placed in talents or riches. The public pay no attention to the former after they have derived the advantages and payed for the form. Men of talent, while superior in intellect to many, yet have to pass through the experiences and disappointments of life as other people. Talent, position, birth nor riches, do not exempt us from the sad experiences of life.

Mr. Robert J. Burdette, the genial humorist, has been licensed to preach by the Baptist church, to which he belongs. Why not? Why cannot even a humorist become a true Christian worker? The man's talents run in that particular channel, and yet these talents could be turned into some spiritual use. The disposition to amuse and be amused can be Christianized and become a great factor in the church. So that humor is not allowed to run in the channel of gross absurdity, it is always appreciated, yet we cannot see its benefit in the pulpit. We suppose that Rev. Burdette will have the sense and Christianity to keep absurdities from the pulpit.

Mr Gladstone is occupied at Haevarden, England, with a duty most men leave to executors. He is arranging his correspondence so that it will give no trouble to those who will be benefited therefrom. To a man occupying the position he does for so many years, it is a herculean task. Although over eighty years old, we see his conscientiousness. Other public men have left this task for others to do, and it has taken years. Mr Gladstone realizes the fact that his reputation needs caring for, even after he is dead; he is arranging all temporal matters. This is but the result of his Christian conscientiousness, and the principle is worth imitating.